



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,448	05/23/2001	Satoshi Iwata	1075.1167	8881
21171	7590	11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/862,448	IWATA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joshua D. Campbell	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-13 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4-13 and 16-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination filed on 08/23/2005.
2. Claims 1, 4-13, and 16-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. The terms "sizeable" and "generally" in claims 1 and 13 is a relative term which render the claims indefinite. The terms "sizeable" and "generally" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Human perception as it is used in the claims, "... so that the outline of the contents of each page is sizeable to the user" and "... so that the whole of each page is generally viewable to the user," is completely indefinite, which brought on a rejection above. The terms "general" and "sizeable" (which is defined as fairly large)

provide no degree to which the claims are to be held. A proper correction is necessary to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 and 13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Endo et al. (hereinafter Endo, US Patent Number 5,801,713, issued on September 1, 1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Endo discloses a method in which a document made up of pages is displayed to user to be read (column 4, lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo discloses that a user may control the display state of the displaying section (column 4, lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo also discloses a method in which each page may be displayed as a whole or an automatic paging sequence that may be set to different speeds will automatically scroll the pages in succession based a display speed (column 2, line 42-column 3, line 50 of Endo). Endo discloses the ability for the user to select from the basic read mode and a plurality of automatic paging modes, this control ultimately controlling what is displayed and how it is controlled (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo discloses a method in which the document may be scrolled in at least

two modes; A1 (cursory mode) which would allow for a user to read the page and view the outlines and A2 (general view mode) which is faster and would simply allow the user to get a good look at the page as a whole (Figures 3 and 4 and column 5, lines 15-25 of Endo).

Regarding independent claim 13, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 4-12 and 16-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (hereinafter Endo, US Patent Number 5,801,713, issued on September 1, 1998) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Palmer et al. (hereinafter Palmer, US Patent Number 6,002,798, issued on December 14, 1999).

Regarding dependent claims 4-7, Endo does not disclose a method in which only the title, a layout-display, document element according to a predetermined condition such as font type and size, and that only an image would be extracted from each page of the document for display. However, Palmer discloses a method in which a document display program will only extract and display the title of documents, the layout of documents, a document element according to font type or size, or an image contained in documents based on the users preferences (Figure 6 and column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Endo does not disclose a method in which a page is displayed schematically by changing the display resolution. However, Palmer discloses a method in which changing the display resolution allows for more rapid viewing of a document with loss of quality, allowing a user to view the document as a schematic rather than a highest quality (column 1, line 30-column 2, line 54 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claims 9 and 10, Endo discloses a method in which the speed at which the pages are scrolled may be set in each mode (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo does not disclose that each display method is established in each mode. However, Palmer discloses a method in which each display method may be individually established for the document viewing process (column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12, Endo discloses a method in which in which different modes may be selected and the paging display mode is based on the selections (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo does not disclose that the selection process consists of switches. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Endo with a method of using switches because it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that a selection process as disclosed by Endo consists of a set of logic that is determined based on selections which could be thought of as virtual switches.

Regarding dependent claims 16-20, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 4-8. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 4-8.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 07/08/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
12. Regarding the arguments on pages 6-10 with regards to claims 1 and 13, most specifically the limitation, "...wherein said plurality of automatic paging display modes includes at least the following two display modes: a cursory reading display mode in which display is performed so that the outline of the contents of each page is sizeable to the user; and a general view display mode in which page ejection (paging) is conducted at a speed higher than that of said cursory reading display mode so that the whole of each page is generally viewable to the user," the examiner feels that the invention as claimed is taught in the prior art as shown by the rejection. Endo does disclose a method of allowing the user to automatically set a paging speed (display time per page) with each automatic paging display mode, and to automatically set a display method with each of the paging display mode (each speed), see rejection above and also see Figure 3 (options A1-A4 and their respective operations) and column 5, lines 16-48 of Endo for further clarification. As clearly disclosed in column 5, lines 16-48, A1-A4 are different display modes which consist of automatic page turning at different speeds, which includes two different speeds, one of which is higher than the first. The applicant goes on to argue that the invention of Endo is not based on human perception, however it is very necessary to understand that the invention of the applicant at no point measures human perception, neither in the claims or the specification. Human

perception as it is used in the claims, "... so that the outline of the contents of each page is sizeable to the user" and "... so that the whole of each page is generally viewable to the user," is completely indefinite, which brought on a rejection above. The terms "general" and "sizeable" (which is defined as fairly large) provide no degree to which the claims are to be held. Endo discloses that the user can set the T interval which determines the speed of the modes based on equations, thus the user's own perception is used to determine paging speed in both the normal display and fast display shown in Figure 4 (column 5, lines 16-48 of Endo), because the user determines based on his own perception the speed which is reasonable, the method of Endo is actually based on realistic human perception. However, the applicant's claims describe the determined speed is not determined be the user, thus it is made on a generalization of what the system believes could be considered "human perception", thus the arguments by the applicant on the use of human perception actually contradicts the invention as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
October 31, 2005


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER